



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

apart from the great movement of the Civil War, apart from the supine acquiescence of the Restoration, a self-opinionated, unforgiving, and unforgetting man. Very much alive he certainly was in his day. Has Mr. Masson made him alive to us again? We fear not. At the same time, while we cannot praise either the style or the method of Mr. Masson's work, we cannot refuse to be grateful for it. It is not so much a book for the ordinary reader of biography as for the student, and will be more likely to find its place on the library-shelf than the centre-table. It does not in any sense belong to light literature, but demands all the muscle of the trained and vigorous reader. "Truly, in respect of itself, it is a good life; but in respect that it is a *poet's* life it is naught."

---

7. — *Latin Grammar*. By HENRY JOHN ROBY. *Sounds, Inflexions, Word-formation*. London: Macmillan & Co. 1871.

THE publication of this book is an event in the history of the study of Latin. The marvel is that it has been so long delayed. Certainly the advance guard of Latin scholars is very far ahead of the main body; for though it is more than fifty years since Bopp's Conjugations-System and forty since his Comparative Grammar appeared, this book seems to be the first full official information that has reached the rank and file, at least in the English-speaking division. The youth of to-day learn Latin precisely on the same principles as if Bopp had never lived, though he introduced Comparative Grammar to throw light upon all language, and made known the perfect system of Indian grammar which dates back before any one had ever thought of teaching Greek even among the Greeks themselves. This is certainly not owing to the apathy of teachers, but to the fact that in Latin at least the results of comparative grammar have not been given in an accessible form. It is too much to expect of the lay brethren that they should master three large volumes of Bopp, one immense volume of Schleicher written in a phonetic dialect, two of Corssen and twenty more of Kuhn's *Zeitschrift*, to say nothing of innumerable *Beiträge*, in order to correct the method and the errors of their Latin grammars. And we are persuaded that this book will be eagerly sought for and profitably studied, and that the scientific study of language will be greatly advanced thereby. Moreover, a want has long been felt for a book embodying the results of the latest criticism, which are for the most part concealed in "*Opuscula*" and in such works as Neue's "*Formenlehre*," containing, as our author pathetically says, "thirteen hundred closely printed pages with-

out an index." These two wants, a Latin grammar based on comparative philology, and one based on later textual criticism, the book before us undertakes to supply, and in general with entire success. The digesting of Neue's book has been done with the last degree of faithfulness, so that no one need trouble himself about the thirteen hundred pages, except for citations. And in most respects the philological part of the work is done with equal thoroughness. All the voluminous writings on the subject seem to have been examined and mastered, except, and this we regard as the only fault in the book, the Sanskrit grammar. The author, in allusion apparently to this, says: "It is not the Latin section of a comparative grammar of the Indo-European tongues." Nor in fact ought it to have been, but by this the author evidently means that he has not used other languages for comparison, except as he says sparingly the Greek. The advantage he derived from this language might have suggested the still greater advantage of a comparison with the more primitive Sanskrit. As he rightly sees: "It is no doubt true that progress in the knowledge of language is to be attained only, as in other sciences, by the constant action and reaction of theory and observation, of the comparison of phenomena in different languages with the special investigation of each for itself." Here the word "theory" is not well chosen perhaps, but the meaning is plain. He chooses the latter part. "But," he continues, "it is true all the same, that if one's eyes are but armed or practised (and some study of comparative philology alone can arm them), a closer and longer gaze detects something which might otherwise be overlooked." In the author's case the nice sense and correct judgment which are necessary for such a work are supplied in general by his own scholarly mind sharpened by a careful study of comparative philology. For the most part, therefore, the book is a safe guide for those who have not time for the study of his original sources, and his good sense and diligence make it valuable for even those who have. The book ought to be welcomed by all who wish to put classical studies on a scientific basis, and who recognize the study of language — the product of the human mind — as a science equally deserving attention with the study of nature. The book contains a hundred pages of observations explanatory of the various parts; including a justification of the improved system of pronunciation, which is very good, and indicates a more careful study of phonetics than is usually brought to bear on the subject. The question perhaps does not need this treatment, but it will no doubt be satisfactory to many. The pronunciation of *ae* as *a* in *bat* lengthened we cannot recommend. All the indications point to a diphthongal sound, something like the English word *ay*. About eighty

pages are devoted to the letters (sounds), and their phonetic changes both in Latin itself and in their descent from the mother tongue are given very fully and judiciously in an arrangement which seems to us the best one, namely, under each letter. We miss here, however, any recognition of vowel intensification or increase, which plays so important a part in Sanskrit, Greek, and Gothic, and has left its traces widely but sparsely throughout Latin. The author alludes to it elsewhere (p. xxiii), but declines to follow "Sanskrit principles" on this subject. He says this without meaning any slur, and is himself dissatisfied with the "parts of his grammar which deal with contraction hiatus, and change of vowel quantity." But, in such a connection, "Sanskrit principles" means principles of historical development from the mother tongue, of which that language is the oldest, and, if corrected by comparison with others, the truest exponent, and these principles cannot safely be lost sight of in a scientific grammar. It is as if an English grammarian should refuse to treat *man*, *men*, *foot*, *feet*, on German principles, without which they are unintelligible. The variation of vowels is as plain in *perfidus*, *fido*, *foedus*, as it is in *ἐλπιον*, *λείπω*, *λέλοιπα*, or *div*, *deva*, *daiva*, and is as important to account for *dūco* by the side of *dūcis* (*dux*), *eo* by the side of *itum*, and long perfect penults with short present, as any other affection of sound. Here a familiarity with Sanskrit would have given, not any more knowledge, to be sure, but a wider view and more correct feeling. Quantity is well and fully treated, even as regards the measure of early poets, an accessible treatment of which has long been wanted.

Under accent, Corssen's doctrine of the original freedom of the accent as to place does not find the recognition to which it seems entitled, although the doctrine is not as yet perfectly established.

Under gender (p. 104), we have a most careful digest of Neue's book, above referred to, which seems absolutely complete. The same completeness appears in the inflection of nouns (p. 112), and the etymology of this part is also sound. The adjective and substantive are recognized as only different uses of the same form, and hence are treated together. This arrangement is good, perhaps, to bring out more strongly their original identity, but it seems to us that practically the Latin makes a distinction between them, so that the old way is better. The peculiar tendency of the Latin adjective to the *i* declension (as *animus*, *exanimis*, *cornu*, *bicornis*) indicates so strong an effort to distinguish the two parts of speech, that it may well be recognized. The change of the old order of cases and the omission of the vocative seem unnecessary innovations in a matter of no scientific value. The separation of the forms of comparison from inflections is troublesome,

and no compensating advantage seems to be gained. The account of them is in three different places in the grammar, which is somewhat puzzling. The two forms of stems in *ro* (p. 117), those with and without original *e*, are confounded, probably on account of the great difficulty of distinguishing them, but certainly a few never had the *e* except in the nominative. The correspondence of such words as *ager* and of such forms as *sacer*, *integer*, formed apparently with the primary suffix *ra*, is too great in many languages to allow the idea of syncopation, though in some, such as *arbiter*, it has undoubtedly taken place, and in others it is doubtful. The adjectives with gen. *īus* (p. 126) are put with pronouns, where they properly belong, as their inflection shows, to say nothing of their kindred in other languages. The declension of *quis* and *qui* (p. 130) is somewhat confusing, being scattered through two pages. The two words might well be given together, as their stems are akin, and, in fact, inextricably confounded in Latin as in Sanskrit. Their etymology is sufficiently shown, however. It seems a blemish that *cujus-a-um* is called a declinable genitive (p. 130). It seems as much entitled to be an adjective as *meus*, etc. In the *u* stems, *sūs* with long *u* is not distinguished from *fructūs*, whereas the length of the *u* is probably original, and caused it to be treated as a consonant stem. The treatment of *i* stems, both the true in *is* and the bastard in *es* (p. 136), is admirable. Here, again, it seems unfortunate that the adjectives are not distinguished as suggested above. Equally good are the consonant stems (p. 149), but the separation of *robur* as an *r* stem from *corpus* as an *s* stem is confusing. The chapter on adverbs, representing them as extinct case forms is a model of arrangement and fulness. A more extended comparison of cognate forms would be very instructive. The adverbs in *tim* it seems hardly possible to separate from *partim*, and hence we like to consider them formed as accusatives, rather than with our author as locatives.

It is in the verb that we most miss the comparison of other languages; and, on the whole, this part is less satisfactory than the rest of the book. The forms which the Latin inherited can only be satisfactorily explained in connection with the other tongues, and the want of this comparison leads, as we think, to several errors. The division into vowel and consonant stems (p. 200) seems not scientific. There can be no doubt that the first, second, and fourth conjugation are variations of the form which appears as the causal form (10th class) in Sanskrit, and it seems almost equally certain that the third conjugation corresponds to the first and other classes which form the present stem in *a*, while the second and third classes, the only true consonant verbs, (that is, which form the stem without any *a*;) have in Latin merely fragments, as in

some parts of *sum*, *edo*, etc. Thus, *voco* seems to correspond to *vāchayāmi*, *deleo* to *dālayāmi*, *veho* to *vahāmi*, *sopio* to *svāpayāmi*. In all these a vowel *a* appears, so that to speak of consonant stems is misleading, if not incorrect. Even in *estis*, the author (p. 188) speaks of the conjugation vowel as originally present, which is certainly wrong if we compare *esse*, *sta*, *yeste*, *este*, and the numerous verbs formed in the same manner in Sanskrit. So the view peculiar to the author (p. 204), that the stem suffix *e* of the second conjugation was originally short, can hardly be maintained on any comparison of forms in other languages. A peculiarly unfortunate hypothesis is the one (p. 194) that the future indicative arises from suffixing *ī* to the stem of the present subjunctive, and it is not maintained by any other philologist so far as we know. This form cannot well be separated from the Sanskrit optative *bhareyam*, *bhares*, *bharet*, which is evidently formed by adding the imperfect (probably of the subjunctive or *Lêṭ*) of *ya* or *i* to the present stem, and of this form, or an earlier one, the Latin form is a lineal descendant. The origin of the second person singular imperative (p. 189) is not happily explained, for *es* must correspond to *īṣṭhi* and *ēdhi* (both for *asdhi*), and so consists merely of the root, having lost the termination, which was probably lengthened as a kind of compensation. The shorter forms of the perfect and supine of the first and second conjugation are treated as if formed by contraction or weakening. This seems to us an error, though all scholars are not agreed on this point. It is more probable that the terminations *vi* and *tum* are added at once to the root, and that when *i* appears it is the same as the inserted *i* in Sanskrit, a kind of connecting vowel of different origin from the usual *a*. Thus the *i* of *cubitum*, *monitum*, is the same as that in *vomitum*, to which Sanskrit *vamitum* exactly corresponds. However, on the whole, a true picture of the Latin conjugation is given. Then follows a complete enumeration of all derived Latin words, under their formative suffixes, including primary suffixes, and even where the roots do not appear in Latin. In a few cases endings are confounded with suffixes, but on the whole the difficulties are successfully met. The appendices give various items of information, which are not so new nor so inaccessible as those in the main body of the work. The second part, on Syntax, is to follow.

It will be seen that this book is one that teachers cannot well do without, and it is to be hoped that a school grammar upon equally sound principles may appear as soon as possible.